

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, 22nd March, 2018

Present:- **Councillors** Cherry Beath, Patrick Anketell-Jones, Rob Appleyard, Tim Ball, Colin Barrett, Jasper Becker, Sarah Bevan, Colin Blackburn, John Bull, Neil Butters, Anthony Clarke, Matt Cochran, Paul Crossley, Chris Dando, Matthew Davies, Sally Davis, Douglas Deacon, Emma Dixon, Michael Evans, Andrew Furse, Charles Gerrish, Ian Gilchrist, Lizzie Gladwyn, Bob Goodman, Francine Haeberling, Alan Hale, Liz Hardman, Steve Hedges, Deirdre Horstmann, Eleanor Jackson, Steve Jeffries, Les Kew, Barry Macrae, Shaun Stephenson-McGall, Alison Millar, Robin Moss, Paul Myers, Lisa O'Brien, Michelle O'Doherty, Bryan Organ, Lin Patterson, June Player, Vic Pritchard, Joe Rayment, Liz Richardson, Caroline Roberts, Nigel Roberts, Dine Romero, Richard Samuel, Will Sandry, Mark Shelford, Brian Simmons, Peter Turner, Martin Veal, Karen Walker, Geoff Ward, Tim Warren, Karen Warrington and Chris Watt

Apologies for absence: **Councillors** Fiona Darey, Marie Longstaff, Paul May, Michael Norton, Christopher Pearce and David Veale

77 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out on the agenda.

78 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Monitoring Officer issued a general dispensation for any Councillors in receipt of benefits in respect of item 15 – “Free School Meals”.

Councillor Joe Rayment declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 13 - “Supporting the Children of Alcoholics”, as a member of staff at DHI who provide drug and alcohol treatment services. The Monitoring Officer declared a dispensation for Councillor Rayment to participate in the debate and vote.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson declared an ‘other’ interest in item 14 - “Badger Cull” as a shareholder in RADCO who own a large dairy herd at Hardington (unaffected by TB).

Councillor Robin Moss declared an ‘other’ interest in item 14 – “Badger Cull”. This declaration was made at the item.

Councillor Chris Watt declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 14 - “Badger Cull” as a Director of Microgenetics Ltd which has research collaboration with Bristol University to develop Bovine TB testing and is entering into field based trials of its testing methods with the Animal Plant Health Agency. This declaration was made at item 14. Councillor Watt then withdrew from the meeting for that item.

79 MINUTES - 13TH FEBRUARY 2018

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of 13th February 2018, including the exempt minute, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

80 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OR FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Chair made the customary announcements regarding mobile phones, webcasting, Councillors accessing meeting papers via their ipads and a comfort break. She explained that the exempt item 9 would be moved to the end of the agenda.

The Chair informed Councillors that she had hosted the Civic Reception the previous evening which had gone well and raised around £1000 for charity. She thanked her team for all the hard work in organising this.

The Chair informed the Council of the recent death of former Wansdyke and B&NES Councillor and Alderman, Les Sell, and asked the Council to stand for a minute's silence.

The Chair then apologised to Councillors for the removal of the Union Jack flag from the Chamber for the previous meeting and the unsatisfactory nature of her explanation of this to the Chamber at that time. [A full copy of the apology has been added to the Council Minute book.]

81 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There were no items of urgent business.

82 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Statements were made by the following members of the public;

Christine Boyd made a statement about air quality with reference to the 31st March deadline for the Outline Business case submission and regretted the lack of scrutiny involvement in this. She commented that responsibility for this should not just rest with Cabinet members and enquired why B&NES had not been able to include scrutiny involvement in the way that Bristol City Council had. Councillor Tim Warren asked Christine if she was aware that Bristol CC had received their instruction 5 months earlier, to which she responded that she was aware they had managed to consult scrutiny. Councillor Richard Samuel asked about circumstances in which items not included in the first list could later be included. Christine responded that it would seem problematic for items to be included retrospectively.

Rachel Willis addressed the meeting about parking in Freeview Road and the specific problems with parking on the verges. She proposed a solution which had met with the approval of all the residents to whom she had spoken. A full copy of Rachel's statement has been placed on the Minute book and attached to the online

minutes. Councillor Mark Shelford asked Rachel if she would be happy to visit the area with himself and an officer to look at options. Rachel said she would welcome this. Councillor Dine Romero asked Rachel if she was aware of the extensive work that Councillor Tim Ball had carried out in this area, to which Rachel replied that she was, but that further action was now needed. Councillor Joe Rayment asked Rachel whether there was any argument for keeping the grass, to which she responded that, in its current state, there wasn't as it was just mud. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked about the visual impact of the disappearance of losing the verges and Rachel replied that she had received universally positive support for her suggestion.

Sarah Moore made a statement about the closure of Bath Community Academy and the pressure on secondary school places. She explained the negative impact of this on local children having to travel further by car or pay bus fares and add to traffic congestion. She asked if there wasn't anything further that could be done to provide secondary education on the Rush hill site as urgent action was needed. Councillor Dine Romero asked if Sarah was aware of the recent DFE report outlining the number of children without school places this September and projected for 4 years from now, to which Sarah replied that she was and that a school was definitely needed on that site. A suggestion from Councillor Dine Romero to hold a 10 minute debate on this subject was not supported by Councillor Tim Warren, but he suggested a separate member briefing be held on the subject. Councillor Eleanor Jackson subsequently suggested this should come to the Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel which was welcomed by Sarah. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked Sarah if the arguments used when Culverhay was threatened with closure were still valid, to which Sarah responded that those arguments still held as the schools around Culverhay had increased their intake at that time, but they were now reducing again so there weren't sufficient places available.

David Redgewell addressed the Council about various transport issues. He expressed concern about the lack of progress on a bus strategy. He urged Members and officers to continue to drive forward in securing funding for the area and suggested vigilance was needed to check that B&NES didn't end up paying for out of authority projects such as the new Bristol arena. A full copy of David's statement has been placed on the Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Mark Shelford asked if David was aware that WECA were going to publish their Bus Strategy in June, to which he replied that he was, and it was important to make sure there were sufficient resources to put it into action. Councillor Neil Butters asked David whether he felt we should be doing more to promote MetroWest. He responded that it could do with a push, but acknowledged the difficulty with North Somerset not being involved. Councillor John Bull referred to David's comment that bus franchising was important in improving the network and wondered if David considered WECA was doing enough on this. David responded that the Mayor should be doing that kind of study as it sharpened the operator's viewpoint in a franchising climate.

Paula Riseborough from Protect our NHS B&NES made a statement outlining their concerns about the RUH plans to set up a subsidiary company to manage support staff and calling on B&NES to ask the RUH to bring these proposals to a meeting of the Health & Wellbeing Select Committee (HWSC). A full copy of the statement can be seen on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Pritchard asked if Paula was aware that an invitation had already been issued to

senior RUH staff to come to the HWSC, to which Paula replied that she had found out this evening and was very pleased. In response to a question from Councillor Tim Ball about the RUH's approach to this, Paula responded that there appeared to be a lack of transparency about sharing the business case. Councillor Robin Moss asked, in the light of the concerns raised, whether Council could hold a 10 minute debate on this issue. Councillor Tim Warren was not in agreement – there was an opportunity for debate at the HWSC.

The Chair referred all statements to the relevant Cabinet Members.

83 REQUEST BY CAMELEY PARISH COUNCIL TO CHANGE ITS NAME TO TEMPLE CLOUD WITH CAMELEY PARISH COUNCIL

The Council considered a request from Cameley Parish Council to change its name for the reasons set out in the report.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Karen Warrington, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

1. To note the receipt of the request from Cameley Parish Council to change its name; and
2. To agree to the making and publication of a Notice under Section 75 of the Local Government Act 1972 to change the name of Cameley Parish Council to Temple Cloud with Cameley Parish Council.

84 ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHAIRMAN DESIGNATE FOR 2018/19

On a motion from Councillor Sarah Bevan, seconded by Councillor Tim Warren, it was unanimously

RESOLVED that Councillor Karen Walker be designated as Council Chairman for the Council year 2018/19.

85 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - ETHICAL CARE CHARTER

On a motion from Councillor Vic Pritchard, seconded by Councillor Francine Haeberling, it was

RESOLVED as set out below;

Council notes that:

1. A national survey of homecare workers undertaken by UNISON, entitled *Time to Care*, found a committed but poorly paid and treated workforce doing its best to maintain good levels of quality care in a system that is in crisis and that poor terms and conditions for workers can contribute towards lower standards of care for people in receipt of homecare services.

2. In light of these findings, UNISON has called on local authorities to commit to becoming Ethical Care Councils by commissioning services which adhere to its Ethical Care Charter. To date, at least 28 councils and a number of social care companies have signed up to the Charter.

Council believes that:

3. By adopting minimum standards for our homecare services, such as those suggested within the Ethical Care Charter, the dignity and quality of life of vulnerable people and the workers who care for them will be protected.
4. Good quality homecare is a key part of the wider Adult Care system, and can reduce demand both for expensive residential care and A&E admissions. It can also help to address bed blocking.
5. It is vital that the Council promotes good working conditions of homecare workers and the retention of skilled and experienced staff thereby ensuring that vulnerable people will be more likely to have a regular care worker with whom they can develop a trusting relationship, and the Council's homecare services already meet many of the standards set out within the Ethical Care Charter.
6. The Council should take the aims of this Charter into account when setting future standards of care.

Council resolves therefore:

7. To ask the Cabinet Member to bring forward a report to the Health & Wellbeing Select Committee in May, outlining the proposed standards to be specified when we recommission homecare services in 2018, taking account of the principles proposed within the Ethical Care Charter.

[Notes;

1. *The opening motion, as set out in the agenda (moved by Councillor Robin Moss, seconded by Councillor Eleanor Jackson), was amended during debate with the resolutions above; carried on a vote of 49 Councillors in favour, 7 against and 2 abstentions.*
2. *Once successfully amended, the above substantive motion was carried unanimously.]*

86 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - SUPPORTING THE CHILDREN OF ALCOHOLICS

On a motion from Councillor Liz Hardman, seconded by Councillor Robin Moss, it was

RESOLVED that

Council notes:

- 1 The publication of a report by the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology in February 2018 which estimated that between 189,000 and

208,000 children in England live with an alcohol-dependent adult, while 15,500 children live with an adult receiving treatment for alcohol dependence, but that these figures are likely to underestimate the scale of the issue due to under-reporting of alcohol consumption and the unknown number of children whose parents are not in treatment and who are not known to social services.

- 2 That the same report found that between 2011 and 2014, Parental Alcohol Misuse (PAM) was implicated in 37% of cases involving the death or serious injury of a child through neglect or abuse, and that 61% of care applications in England involved misuse of alcohol and/or drugs.
- 3 That Children living with alcohol-dependent parents report feeling socially isolated, and are reluctant to seek help due to feelings of stigma, shame and guilt about not wanting to betray parents. Children may have to take on caring responsibilities for the affected parent or younger siblings which can negatively impact school attendance and homework.
- 4 The All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) for the Children of Alcoholics report *A Manifesto for Change* which sets out ten key points that the Government needs to address if the children of alcoholics are to be properly supported.

Council believes that:

- 5 It has a responsibility to support the children of alcoholics and to ensure that the needs of these children are met.

Council agrees therefore to:

- 6 Ask the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to provide assurance, via the Children and Young People Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel that all the relevant policies, procedures and strategies of this Council recognise and address the particular needs of the children of alcoholics.
- 7 Invite the National Association for the Children of Alcoholics (NACOA) to comment on the Council's support offer for the children of alcoholics, and for this comment to also be submitted to the Children and Young People Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel.
- 8 Ask the Leader of Council to write to our local MPs and to Government asking that priority be given to implementing the ten key points identified within the report of the All-Party Parliamentary Group for the Children of Alcoholics, *A Manifesto for Change*, including creating a national strategy for the children of alcoholics and ensuring that local support for the children of alcoholics is properly funded.

[Notes;

1. The above resolution was carried on a unanimous vote.
2. During debate, an unsuccessful amendment from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor Richard Samuel to add the words "and people with other addictions" after the word "alcoholics" in paragraphs 5 and 6 was lost, with 15 Councillors voting in favour, 42 against and 1 abstention.]

87 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - BADGER CULL

On a motion from Councillor Joe Rayment, seconded by Councillor Eleanor Jackson, it was

RESOLVED that

Council notes:

- 1) That Natural England has received an application for badger culling in Avon.
- 2) That badger culling has already been taking place in Somerset for a number of years.
- 3) That only 5.7% of incidences of bovine tuberculosis (bTb) are caused by badgers.
- 4) That millions of pounds are spent each year on the badger cull, with each culled badger costing thousands of pounds.
- 5) That the badger cull is more than seven times more expensive per badger than the Welsh government's badger vaccination scheme.
- 6) That reports show that up to 22.8% of badgers culled take more than 5 minutes to die, making the cull inhumane by government standards.
- 7) That organisations opposed to the badger cull include: the RSPCA, the RSPB, and the Wildlife Trusts (including Avon Wildlife Trust).
- 8) That landowner permission is required for the badger cull to take place on any land.

Council believes:

- 1) That the badger cull has been ineffective.
- 2) That more effective means of controlling bTb include: testing, movement control and vaccination.
- 3) That the government should revisit the evidence on badger culling and end the programme.
- 4) That public money could be far better spent than on spending an estimated £100 million on badger culling by 2020.

Council resolves:

- 1) To refuse permission for any badger culling to take place on land controlled by the Council.
- 2) To encourage parish councils to implement the same policy.
- 3) To write to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to inform him of our decision, but to offer access to Council land for a coordinated badger vaccination programme.

[Notes;

1. *Following the motion being moved, the Head of Legal Services addressed the Council expressing some concern that the information supporting this motion was not current or specific to B&NES, and advised therefore that further work was needed to enable a considered decision. Councillor Joe Rayment then amended the motion to replace the word “owned” with the word “controlled” in resolution 1.*
2. *The above resolution was carried with 25 Councillors voting in favour, 22 Councillors voting against and 10 abstentions.]*

88 MOTION FROM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - FREE SCHOOL MEALS

On a motion from Councillor Alison Millar, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was

RESOLVED that

Council notes:

- That, during the transition of benefit claimants onto Universal Credit, the Government temporarily relaxed the criteria for free school meals by making Universal Credit a qualifying benefit for free school meals, regardless of income.
- That the Coalition Government made clear in 2013 that this would be an interim measure during the roll-out of Universal Credit, and that some form of means or eligibility test would need to be introduced once Universal Credit was fully rolled out.
- That these transitional protections will mean that nobody currently receiving free school meals will lose their entitlement when moving onto Universal Credit, and once the full roll out of universal credit is complete (2022) pupils will continue to receive free school meals until the end of their current phase of education.
- That under the new criteria, those earning more than £7,400 a year from work will no longer be eligible for free school meals, equivalent to an annual income of between £18,000 and £24,000 once benefits are taken into account. These proposals will affect free school meals for children in year 3 and above. Transitional protections will ensure that no child currently receiving free school meals will have them taken away.
- That under the new criteria, around 50,000 more children will benefit from a free school meal by 2022 than under the previous benefits system introduced by Labour – and that the new eligibility criteria will only apply to new UC claimants, not those already receiving free meals.
- That all children in Reception, Year 1 and Year 2 will continue to receive free school meals.

- It is estimated that, nationally, only about 65 per cent of children who are eligible for free school meals take them up, often because parents do not realise their children are entitled, and therefore more could be done, at both the local and national level, to ensure that all those eligible for Free School Meals are aware of their entitlement.
- B&NES Council is currently encouraging local Universal Credit recipients to sign up for free school meals and promoting the additional Pupil Premium funding that schools receive, and that as a full UC area since May 2016, more children within B&NES will be protected by the transitional arrangements than in authorities that are still to move into full Universal credit service.

Council resolves:

- Council calls on the Government to work with schools, academies and local authorities to raise awareness of families' eligibility for Free School Meals and encourages all those entitled to Free School Meals to take them up.
- Council requests that the Leader of Council communicate this position and the above motion to the Department for Education, Department for Work and Pensions, relevant Ministers and local MPs.

[Notes;

- 1. The above resolution was proposed by Councillor Michael Evans and accepted into the substantive motion by Councillor Alison Millar.*
- 2. The resolution was carried with 48 Councillors voting favour, 7 Councillors voting against and no abstentions.]*

89 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The Chair made reference to the 5 questions from Councillors, and the responses, which had been circulated and attached to the online minutes.

Councillor Richard Samuel made a statement about the Air Quality plan. He objected to the fact that, despite the deadline for first submission having been known since July 2017, the plan was being handled as an urgent decision and therefore exempt from scrutiny or call-in. He noted the final deadline of 31st December and called on the Chief Executive to ensure that urgency provisions would not be used for that submission deadline. Councillor Tim Warren asked Councillor Samuel if he was aware that the proposals were coming back for full consultation, to which he responded that he was aware; however, normal practice was surely for Councillors to decide what was being consulted upon. Councillor Dine Romero asked if there was anything else pertinent to this in the letter from DEFRA. Councillor Samuel responded that he had approached DEFRA to get a clear answer about where responsibility lay for submitting a response and had been clearly told that it was up to individual Councils to decide how they handled their process for doing this. He added that Bristol City Council had taken this through their scrutiny processes. Councillor John Bull asked if he had let Councillor Samuel know that, as Chair of the Panel, he had contacted the Director to follow this up and that one of the reasons why scrutiny involvement hadn't been possible was partly due to officer resources

being needed to prepare the submission. Councillor Samuel responded that he appreciated Councillor Bull's help with this but he would have expected a project plan to build in the necessary scrutiny with Members.

90 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Karen Warrington, it was

RESOLVED that, having been satisfied that the public interest test would be better served by not disclosing relevant information, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business because of the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as amended.

[Notes;

- 1. The above resolution was carried with 33 Councillors voting in favour and 23 Councillors voting against.]*

91 SENIOR MANAGEMENT AND WIDER SERVICE RE-STRUCTURE 2018-2020

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Karen Warrington, it was

RESOLVED that the Council notes;

1. The reasons and rationale for the proposed changes to service structures;
2. That the Restructuring Implementation Committee has agreed delegated authority to the Chief Executive to take the necessary steps to implement the proposals;
3. That the costs of the restructure will be met from earmarked reserves as approved by Council on 13th February 2018; and
4. That a further report to Council on 10th May 2018 will be made to designate a Section 151 Officer.

[Notes;

- 1. The above resolution was carried with 32 Councillors voting in favour, 14 Councillors voting against and 11 abstentions.]*

The meeting ended at 10.06 pm

Chairman

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

The statement that I'm going to read relates to the last full Council Meeting on 13th February.

I wish to apologise for the Union Flag not being in the Chamber for this meeting.

The reason why it was not there was entirely my fault and due to my actions in querying whether it was needed at the Budget meeting. Given my position, and authority, this led to the flag being immediately removed before the meeting.

I wish also to apologise unreservedly for suggesting to Council that I did not know why it wasn't there. In doing so I, in effect, lied to Council. I accept that my conduct did not display the standards of leadership and openness required of my role and for that I am truly sorry.

I am under a lot of pressure at the moment, with care of my elderly mother, and I admit I just wasn't thinking straight. I was overly concerned that the Budget process should not be derailed at the start of the Meeting, and I feared a long discussion about the issue of the flag would ensue, and I wanted to defer that from happening and I gave the wrong call. I am happy to speak to anyone to give them more details about the circumstances, should you want that.

All I would like to add is that to me, and my family, the Union Flag has personal importance. My husband and brother both served in the armed forces and I hope Council accepts that I would never disrespect the Flag.

**Councillor Cherry Beath
Council Chairman 2017/18**

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL 22nd MARCH 2018

PUBLIC STATEMENTS

PUBLIC SPEAKERS – ITEM 7

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Christine Boyd | Air Quality | |
| 2. Rachel Willis | Parking in Freeview road | <i>(attached)</i> |
| 3. Sarah Moore | BCA closure/secondary school places | |
| 4. David Redgewell | Bus Strategies | <i>(attached)</i> |
| 5. Paula Riseborough | RUH | <i>(attached)</i> |

This page is intentionally left blank

Christine Boyd statement to Council 22.3,2018

Just when you thought the beast from the East had passed, here I am again with another chilling story of being frozen out by this council despite its warm words.

First of all let me say that being directed by government to improve air quality is not a gold star to be celebrated, it's a punishment for failure. Lets begin by being honest about that.

By the 31st of March the council must have submitted an initial local plan to Defra shortlisting measures to bring nitrogen dioxide levels within legal limits. But how many of you have seen this short list?

The public hasn't and the CTE scrutiny committee hasn't, and yet there is no good reason why secrecy should surround a matter of such great public concern.

I had hoped we had moved on from the days of having to drag information out of this council with FOIs, but apparently not, a new veil of secrecy has fallen over everything concerned with air quality;

- Scrutiny has been denied its constitutional role, apparently this is an 'urgent item' even though the council has known of the Defra deadline since last summer.
- Community groups have been told they cant have the annual air quality data that is normally made available
- And the results of the automatic number plate recognition study are apparently too sensitive to be shared – so maybe we will never find out who drives where in Bath.

It you think I am just being difficult, consider the situation in Bristol where they also have to comply with the same Defra directions in the same timescale.

- They shared their initial air quality plans with scrutiny weeks ago.
- They asked their Cabinet to approve them on the 6th of March with every detail of their approach and their recommendations set out in a 28 page public report.
- Meanwhile Banes officers have asked just two Cabinet members to approve the plans for this city, based on a shoddy two page report that explains nothing

Apparently scrutiny can see this after Easter, but there's not much point in checking stable door once the horse has bolted is there? And with no disrespect to you, Cllrs Goodman and Shelford, this places far too much responsibility on your shoulders alone. I would not want to be in your place if Defra reject Banes plans and impose their own on the city or if someone decides to JR your decision.

Cabinet, it may not feel like it, but you are meant to be in charge – stand up to this, refuse to sign off on plans that have not had proper scrutiny, change the constitution if necessary. If you don't hold officers to account, then expect people to conclude that these are your actions not theirs, and to hold you to account for poor governance and for any poor decisions that result.

This page is intentionally left blank

Rachel Willis Statement – 22 March 2018

Hi, I'm a resident of Freeview Road and I'm here to talk about the parking problem that we have.

Freeview Road is in Twerton, it runs parallel to the High Street and is sandwiched in between Twerton Park on one side and Bath City Farm on the other. There is no through route as it ends at Innox Park.

I moved to Freeview Road just over 2 years ago and parking has always been a bit of an issue, but one that is getting progressively worse. The way the road is designed there is only street parking on one side of the road, so if every household has a car we are already at capacity. Some households have two cars and there's a few work vans that live on our street which basically means the parking is full by about 6pm and after that people's only option is to park on the grass verges.

The verges themselves are getting into a really bad state, especially over the winter they are a churned up muddy mess. Cars have been known to get stuck on them when it has rained as the mud turns slick. It's also not that fun walking through the mud to get to your car in the morning.

So why can't people park elsewhere? Well they could, but because of where the road is you would have to walk a long way back to your house in the dark or use dark alleys which don't feel particularly safe, so for most people it's not a viable option.

This is not just a safety issue for car drivers either, it is also a problem for pedestrians, as it leads to cars regularly driving over pavements to get to and from parking spaces and using pavements as passing places.

I'm sure you have lots of people come and complain about parking on their roads, so what makes Freeview Road any different? Well, that it's a residents parking problem. This is not like roads by the hospital where there will always be more people wanting to park. Our parking problem is at evenings and weekends when all residents are at home. If we could create an extra 20 spaces, this would not be a problem anymore.

And that's the other thing that makes us different, there is an easy solution.

I carried out a parking survey of my neighbours last week and the response was swift and resounding. Within minutes of putting flyers through people's doors they were accosting me in the street and since then I've had a steady stream of returns through my door. Not one person wouldn't support turning some of the verges into parking spaces, either by properly widening the road and extending the existing parking bay area or putting concrete blocks in so that at least they aren't parking on the mud.

So I would ask the council to make a small investment to make parking on our road safe and available for everyone there.

This page is intentionally left blank

Light Rail around Bristol and Bath

We want to see the budget for the light rail consultation studies in the Greater Bristol area to be fully protected and support the principles of a light rail route to Bristol Airport as a top priority and later to Bath especially from Lambridge across the City to Newbridge which could then make use of the light rail corridor to Bristol through Bitton, Saltford, Kelston, Warmley to Yate and East Bristol via Mangotsfield, Staple Hill and Fishponds as well as linking into the RUH at Weston, the new Bath Spa College of Art & Design at Weston Lock and Park & Ride sites which need to be co-ordinated with the Bristol Mayor's rapid transit project. The two schemes must link to Warmley and Emersons Green. Retention of Avon Valley Railway steam services at weekends. Provision should be made for a continuous cycle/walkway between Bristol and Bath where possible. The implementation of light rail would help bring the City region into line with EU emission and clean air targets together with the introduction of clean fuel buses and taxis.

The corridor to Odd Down is welcomed however the majority of the traffic is to the Somer Valley at Peasedown, Radstock and Mid Somer Norton and therefore an extension of a rapid transit system to this area would be beneficial. What evaluation of the Somerset and Dorset railway corridor has been carried out as Norton Radstock is an enterprise zone and needs public transport improvement.

The route to Bath University seems to have gradient constraints and requires considerable engineering works and it should also be noted that all LRT schemes approved in the UK have been conurbation wide eg Midland Metro (Birmingham - Wolverhampton), Greater Manchester, Nottingham and Croydon and will require DFT funding and approvals in the long term and in the short term to be in the Metro Mayors joint transport plan.

Bus/Rail integration

This is required at Bath Spa station and other locations where light rail might possibly connect with buses. Across Europe and Greater Manchester/London rapid transit is fully integrated into the bus network.

There should be investment in MetroWest between Westbury, Bath and Bristol currently out for consultation with the DFT as part of the GWR franchise with First Group as the operator until 2022. This could include a business unit for Bristol and Bath, Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire & Greater Bristol.

SWTN also want to see the GWR franchise kept as one complete business unit and not split up as proposed by the DFT. The GWR IEP electrification programme should also be completed in the shortest possible time to assist with high technology rail job creation opportunities in the region together with the Henbury loop rail project serving the proposed Arena.

There should also be a Greater Bristol business unit within the GWR franchise with devolved powers similar to the West Midlands and Greater Manchester PTE's.

Bus proposals can be included as should future schemes eg light rail integration and the Overground rail project in Bristol.

Arena issues

A full transport plan would need to be drawn up with First Group on whichever site the Mayor and Metro Mayor decide.

Temple Meads Arena would require coach parking, MetroBus stops, coach stops in Avon Street, bus stops at this location and on Bath Road Park & Ride services from Brislington, Parkway, Portway, Ashton Vale, extra trains from Bath and West Wilts, Taunton, W-S-M, Cardiff, Newport, Patchway, Filton, Yate, Gloucester/Cheltenham, Severn Beach via Clifton Down, Henbury loop, Portishead and Swindon.

Regarding a shuttle train from Bristol Parkway to Temple Meads, taxi ranks, ferry terminal, service coaches and car parking including disabled.

Construction of Station Street and bus interchange at the Friary is required as part of the new University campus development at Temple Meads.

Brabazon hanger option

Potential Arena will require coach parking, MetroBus stops, coach stops, bus stops at this location and on Park & Ride services to Brislington, Parkway, Portway, Ashton Vale, extra trains from Bath and West Wilts, Taunton, W-S-M, Cardiff, Newport, Patchway, Filton, Yate, Gloucester, Cheltenham, Severn Beach via Clifton Down, Henbury loop, Portishead and Swindon. There should be 15 minute frequency services on the Henbury loop serving the Arena and 10 minute shuttle bus service on main routes to it.

The IET trains will need to operate from London and South Wales via Parkway to Filton North station for the arena, services from the South West, West Midlands to the Henbury loop station, coach parking will need to be provided, taxis, bus links Greater Bristol wide, links to Cribbs Causeway and hotels will need to be addressed.

We urge the City Council, WECA and Bristol Mayor's to address a full integrated transport plan for the Arena similar to those at Manchester Victoria/Wembley.

The Arena rail services will need to be included in the new rail franchise.

Bus network strategy

There should be no cuts in subsidies but more investment in the local bus network with the Metro Mayor and these issues must be addressed alongside any light rail proposals in Bristol and Bath especially where services like the 16 from Bristol Parkway to Longwell Green via Lodge Causeway have already been cut leaving residents with no buses. The 510/511 bus services in Bristol should also be reinstated as part of an improved orbital bus network together with services 6 & 7 in Bath. The bus network must include evening and Sunday services

Also, with regards to buses we would recommend the retention of services 20A/C Bath circuit, 82-82A Paulton - Radstock, 172 Bath - Paulton - Wells via Peasedown and Mid Somer Norton, 179 Bath - Writhlington via Timsbury/Paulton, 672 Blagdon - Bristol, 768 Clutton - Bath via Clandown and A4 Chandag Road - Bath (early morning journeys.

Bath City services 2, 6A, 8/9 and 265 evening services to Bathampton/Trowbridge should also be retained.

Passengers interchanging between bus/rail routes should have accessible toilet facilities on key routes with money for maintaining/cleaning bus shelters/bus bays. These should include facilities at Shirehampton Green, Eastville Park and Fishponds Park. One way to fund public transport would be to use money raised by parking fees instead of spending it on non transport infrastructure projects like pavement repairs. These toilets are also used by bus drivers and passengers on routes around Bristol. Have any Equalities Impact Assessments been carried out regarding these closures and potential new facilities. Of course in South Gloucestershire, BANES and North Somerset have protected these facilities as part of their transport network.

We remind you that the tourism industry in Bristol is worth £1.3 billion and we do not want the reputation damage to Bristol so these facilities including community toilets and private sector transfers must work.

DAVID REDGEWELL South West Transport Network/TSSA/Railfuture

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement to Bath and NE Somerset Council by Protect Our NHS BANES – March 22nd 2018

Protect our NHS BANES wishes to express our grave concerns about the Royal United Hospital's proposals to set up a wholly owned subsidiary company to employ NHS support staff, including porters, catering staff, security staff, building project managers, architects, tradespeople and administration staff. This would mean that over 500 staff currently employed directly by the NHS would transfer into the new company; this represents about one fifth of RUH staff.

Our concerns are as follows:

- As far as we are aware, there has not been any consultation among the RUH NHS Foundation Trust membership or the wider public on this fundamental proposal.
- The staff affected make a vital contribution to the safe and effective delivery of healthcare at the Royal United Hospital and its associated facilities, especially cleaners, porters, catering staff, tradespeople and administrative staff. Any impact on these staff thus has an impact on patient care.
- New staff will have less favourable terms and conditions of employment to those of existing staff without access to the NHS Pension scheme. This is the case in other parts of the country where this has gone ahead. Existing staff would initially retain their existing terms and conditions under TUPE but the prospect for long-term protection of the pay and pensions of transferred staff is uncertain. This is likely to have a negative effect on recruitment and retention. It is feared by staff and unions that savings made on eroding pay and conditions (moving away from NHS Agenda for Change bands) is the main motivation for these plans.
- Setting up this arm's length company might well set a precedent for other parts of the RUH NHS Trust, meaning further transfers of staff/departments and property into the wholly owned subsidiary.
- Such a wholly owned subsidiary would be a suitable company to be taken over by another private commercial company when the market conditions are favourable, who will then impose their own terms and conditions.
- One of the reasons given for proposing this wholly-owned subsidiary is to avoid VAT payments because of a tax loophole for such companies. But the Dept of Health has advised that wholly-owned subsidiary companies should **not** be set up as a method of avoiding tax. Any savings to the RUH on VAT would not result in any extra income to public services.
- There is no evidence that these proposals will improve efficiency or productivity.

- Transferring these staff from RUH NHS Trust employment to a wholly owned subsidiary will lead to further fragmentation of the NHS, which contradicts current NHS England and local STP plans for more integration of healthcare services.
- NHS support staff take huge pride in working for the NHS and fully support its ethos of high quality care for all; this is one of the reasons that people apply for NHS jobs rather than similar jobs in private companies.

So far these proposals have been discussed in private by the RUH Board; there has been inadequate staff consultation and no public consultation or scrutiny. We believe that the creation of an independent subsidiary company at the RUH would have a significant impact on patient care and on the local health and social care system. This fragmentation is very unwelcome at a time when greater integration and collaboration is being sought.

We would therefore request that the Health and Well Being Select Committee asks the RUH Board to share their business case with them and answer questions before any decision is made.

COUNCIL 22nd MARCH 2018

COUNCILLOR STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS

STATEMENT – ITEM 16

1. Richard Samuel

Air Quality

QUESTIONS – ITEM 16

M	01	Question from:	Cllr Dine Romero
Will the Leader of Council write to both Wera Hobhouse MP and the housing minister, in support of a proposal for additional legislative powers that will help tackle the rise of short term holiday lets? We suggest similar powers to that given to the City of London restricting lets to 90 nights per year?			
Answer from:			Cllr Tim Warren
London has been able to impose a restriction because of the Deregulation Act 2015, which gives the GLA the power to implement this policy, but unfortunately does not apply to other areas. A specific Act of Parliament would be required to give us the same power. The Council has commissioned work as part of our Local Plan refresh to update our assessment of visitor accommodation requirements, as affordable housing is essential to our overall housing strategy and we are concerned about the potential loss of housing for our residents from short term holiday lets. This will consider potential policy approaches to tackling any issues, which could include restrictions. This is a subject that the Leader has already written to Government Ministers about and would be happy to continue to pursue with our partners at WECA.			
M	02	Question from:	Cllr Dine Romero
Will the Cabinet Member for education co-sign letters from the Liberal Democrat Group Leader to both the Regional Schools Commissioner and to the Secretary of State for Education asking that secondary schools in Bath and North East Somerset be allowed to expand off-site, by the start of the next academic year, to provide the additional school places needed in the South West of the City of Bath? This will also help address an expected growth in school related travel?			
Answer from:			Cllr Paul May
No. There are sufficient secondary places in Bath for all Bath based children without creating more. We need all parents to use the five option preferences to ensure that they gain priority			

over children from outside the area being allocated places in Bath.

The decision to close the provision at the BCA was taken by the RSC as it was considered unviable to run a mainstream secondary on that site, after considering a range of options. The schools organisation plan looks at existing and future planners predictions for new development to ensure that there are sufficient local places to meet the need. This plan will be considered by cabinet on 11th April.

M	03	Question from	Cllr Paul Crossley
----------	-----------	----------------------	---------------------------

When the planning permission to proceed with the NRR scheme in Radstock was granted, a S106 commitment was made on Linden Homes to pay £180,000 towards the cost of a footbridge connecting areas 2 and 3 to enable a safe walking route to the Junior School and also provide an important role in improving access between the development and the school. Linden paid this money some time ago but the bridge has not yet been built by the Council. Can the Leader please tell us when the Council will deliver this bridge and use the S106 money it got from Linden to do this?

Answer from:	Cllr Tim Warren
---------------------	------------------------

The footbridge will serve the school and will not form part of the public highway. Officers are in discussion with the Head Teacher regarding future maintenance responsibilities. Once agreed, a detailed feasibility study will be undertaken. It is anticipated that the feasibility study will be undertaken during 2018/19 which will include an updated cost estimate and delivery programme.

M	04	Question from:	Cllr Paul Crossley
----------	-----------	-----------------------	---------------------------

How many bus shelters in B&NES are currently awaiting repair and how long has each of them been waiting since first reported?

- I. What steps have been taken to get recompense from the contractor who has not delivered these repairs?
- II. How will the Cabinet Member ensure his team work with the new contractor to ensure a timely response to bus shelter repair?
- III. Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that residents waiting for a bus do not expect to be waiting at damaged and vandalised stops?

Answer from:	Cllr Mark Shelford
---------------------	---------------------------

There are approximately 20 infrastructure repairs outstanding but that figure includes minor repairs to locks on timetable cases as well as missing panels on shelters. Two repairs are outstanding from November because they require non-standard parts which have to be sourced and supplied. The majority of outstanding shelter repairs were reported to us in January and February. Two of those shelters have been hit by vehicles and require major repairs. The collisions were not reported to the Police and there is some suspicion that the damage was caused deliberately.

- I. There is no repair contract in place at present because prior to the installation of a large number of additional shelters as part of the Bath Transportation Package, repairs were ordered as and when necessary. However, this arrangement was not deemed satisfactory and a decision was taken to procure a contract for repairs to be carried out alongside regular cleaning. The new contract will start on 3 April 2018

<p>II. The new contract includes a response time of 5 working days – with some flexibility if a non-standard part has to be obtained and fitted or if ground works have to be carried out. If repairs are not possible within 5 working days, the site will be made safe as necessary and the contractor will be required to report on progress until resolution. The Council’s Public Transport Team will have access to software that logs site visits by cleaning operatives and engineers, so performance against the standards in the contract will be monitored. Also, we are developing a link to the “Fix My Street” software to enable damage reports by residents to go directly to the contractor.</p> <p>III. I agree and it is widely recognised that well-maintained infrastructure acts as a disincentive to vandalism. Regrettably though, there are some locations where vandalism seems to be persistent so I would encourage communities to report vandalism to the Police if they see it happening. Steps are taken to make infrastructure safe as soon as possible in the event of substantial damage.</p>			
M	05	Question from:	Cllr Tim Ball
<p>The RUH Board has decided to transfer over 500 staff into a Subsidiary company. What communication has the cabinet member had with the RUH on this matter? Would the Cabinet member agree with me that the RUH need to make an urgent presentation to the Health and Wellbeing select committee? Should he agree with me, will he have dialogue with the Chair of the above committee to ensure it takes place at the next available meeting?</p>			
Answer from:			Cllr Vic Pritchard
<p>I can confirm that I have been made aware of this proposal but have not had direct communication with the RUH on this matter. I do agree with Cllr Ball that it would be appropriate to request an urgent presentation to the Health and Wellbeing Select Committee and, to this end, I have discussed this with the Chair of the Select Committee, Cllr Haeberling. I can confirm that a request has been made to the RUH to present at Health and Wellbeing Select Committee on this matter.</p>			

This page is intentionally left blank